REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-8 and 10-11 as being unpatentable under 35 USC 103(a). More specifically claim 1 has been rejected as being obvious over United States Patent No. 6,653,933 to Raschke at al. in view of United States Patent No. 6,580,950 to Johnson. Claim 6 has been rejected as unpatentable over Raschke and Johnson further in view of United States Patent No. 6,757,732 to Sollee. Claim 7 has been rejected over Raschke, Johnson and Sollee further in view of United States Patent No. 6,247,017 to Martin. Claims 8 and 10 have been rejected as being unpatentable as obvious in view of Johnson and Sollee. And claim 11 has been rejected as obvious in view of Johnson, Sollee and Martin. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusions.

Applicants' invention is directed at communications between a smart appliance/device on a local smart appliance network and a global agent/server external to the local smart appliance network. Typically, for a global server to send an instruction message to a smart appliance, the global server must address the message using the smart appliance's actual address, embedding the address in the message. The message is then routed from the global server to the smart appliance using this actual address. (Specification, page 3, line 17 to page 4, line 6; page 12, lines 13-17). Applicants' invention overcomes the need for a server to use actual addresses and uses a modified version of the Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) that allows a server to communicate with a smart appliance using a general unique global network address rather than an actual address.

Specifically, as recited by amended claim 1, applicants' invention is a global appliance network system comprising a global server and a smart appliance on a local network, the smart appliance having an actual network address and a general unique global network address that can map to the actual network address. The global server communicates with the smart appliance using a general addressing scheme. Under this scheme the global server sends an instruction message to the smart appliance by addressing the message with the smart appliance's general unique global network address. The general addressing scheme routes this message from the global server through a communications network to the smart appliance based on the general unique global network address. In other words, each hop through the communications network examines the general unique global network address and based on this address, forwards the message towards the smart appliance. (Specification, page 14, line 17 to page 18, line 8; Figure 3).

The applicants' agree with the Examiner that Raschke does not teach or suggest: (1) the use of a general unique global network address that can map to the actual network

address; (2) using a general addressing scheme identifying in a single message both the general unique global network address and the instruction to be performed on the smart appliance identified by that address; and, (3) wherein the general addressing scheme routes the single message from the global server through the communications network to the smart appliance based on the general unique global network address.

The Examiner asserts that Johnson overcomes these deficiencies in Raschke. Applicants respectfully disagree. The system in Johnson an Internet based home communication system for allowing a homeowner to monitor and control various features of one or more homes through a global computer network. A plurality of control devices are positioned within a home and communicate with a control unit which is connected to the Internet and a data center that can collect and monitor data from the various control devices. The homeowner can view, monitor and control features of his or her home by accessing data via a web-page.

Although there are superficial similarities between the present invention and the home communication system in Johnson, Johnson does not teach or disclose the presently claimed invention. For example, Johnson does not teach or suggest sending instructions to a remote device having a general unique global network address that can map to the actual network address locally. The Examiner points to col. 6, lines 36-50 and col. 7, lines 54-60 of Johnson as disclosing this feature of the present invention. The first cited portion of Johnson states:

> "the homeowner can access data regarding their home through a conventional web browser 14 upon the user's computer. The homeowner can access their specific "control page" 76 upon the web site by using a user name and password or any other acceptable means for accessing the data from their home. The control page 76 can have various structures, design and information available for the homeowner. In addition, the control page 76 may be customizable for allowing only the desired information upon the control page 76 such as the customized information 70 portion of the control page 76. The control page 76 may be customized to display one or more images 74 of a specific home along with customized information 70 relating to weather conditions or other information." (Johnson, col. 6, lines 36-50).

Clearly, this does not teach or suggest the sending of an instruction from a user to a remote device having a general unique global network address that can may to the actual network address locally. There is no discussion of address mapping in the cited portion of Johnson at all.

The second cited portion of Johnson states:

> "The homeowner may then select which home they desire to either "request" information about or provide a "command" to. If the

homeowner simply desires to receive information about a home, they can
select the item that they desire to receive information about such as the
interior temperature of the home or images 74 within the home.
(Johnson, col 7, lines 54-60).

Again, applicants fail to see any connection between this cited language and the
claimed invention particularly the use of a general unique global address that maps to an
actual network address.

Furthermore, applicants disagree that Johnson overcomes the second identified
deficiency in Raschke, i.e., using a general addressing scheme identifying in a single message
both the general unique global network address and the instruction to be performed on the
smart appliance identified by that address. The Examiner cites Johnson as disclosing this
feature of the present invention at col. 7, lines 54-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5. This cited portion
of Johnson describes how a homeowner may request data about his or her home and the data
center 20 collects the information from the control unit at the home and transmits the desired
data to the homeowner for viewing. Nothing in Johnson teaches or suggests the use of an
addressing scheme where a single message is used to identify said smart appliance by said
general unique global network address and also provide the instruction to be performed on
said smart appliance.

Finally applicants disagree that Johnson teaches or suggests a general addressing
scheme that routes a single message from the global server through the communications
network to the smart appliance based on the general unique global network address. The
section in Johnson cited by the Examiner (col. 7, lines 54-67) is the same as that referenced in
the immediately prior discussion. Again this section discusses a homeowner requesting data
about a home by sending a query to a data center which either responds or send a query to the
home control unit to collect data. No discussion is made of local versus global addresses.
Johnson simply does not discuss addressing in any detail.

The error of the Examiner in reading the teaching of the Johnson reference likewise
affects the rejection of claims 6, 7, 8-10 and 11 as the rejection of each of these claims is
dependent upon Johnson. With regard to claim 6, Sollee does not overcome the deficiencies
in Raschke or Johnson nor does Sollee teach or suggest the use of a modified Session
Initiation Protocol for a general addressing scheme. Sollee simply describes the use of SIP in
unmodified form.

With regard to claim 7, Martin does disclose a network application of LDAP it does
not overcome the deficiencies in Raschke, Johnson or Sollee. With regard to claims 8 and 10,
Sollee does not overcome the deficiency in Johnson set forth above. Johnson does not teach
or suggest a one-step location method for remotely operating a smart appliance in a local

smart appliance network from a global agent in a global network. Hollstrom discloses the control of local devices connected via one or more wired or wireless links to a mobile handset (cell-phone) in which the local devices send information to the handset on how to be controlled using the wireless access protocol (WAP). With regard to claim 11, Martin does not overcome the deficiencies of Johnson and Sollee although it does discuss a network application of LDAP.

Applicants respectfully believe that claims 1, 6-8 and 10-11 of this application are in condition to be passed to issue. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of these claims, in view of the above discussion, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

A two-month extension of time from the original due date is hereby respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Telcordia Technologies, Inc.

By: _William A. Schoneman_
William A. Schoneman
Reg. No. 38,047
Tel.: (732) 699-3050

Telcordia Technologies, Inc.
One Telcordia Drive
Piscataway, NJ 08854-4157

Page 7 of 7